

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-13, 15-+30, 32-49, 51-58 and 60-66 are pending in the application.

***Statement of the Substance of the Interview***

At the outset, Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on February 22, 2010. It was greatly appreciated that the Examiner indicated he would consider claim amendments drawn to the allowed subject matter of the claims indicated allowable (e.g., claims 14 and 17) without the extraneous intervening features (such as the timer of claim 13). Accordingly, the claims have been revised to reflect the allowable subject matter as noted below.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation the indication on page 12 of the Office Action that claims 42-44, 54-56, and 63-65 are allowed.

Applicants also notes with appreciation the indication on page 12 of the Office Action that claims 14-17, 31-34, 50-53 and 59-62 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The independent claims have been amended in this manner, and accordingly these claims should now be allowable and all remaining dependent claims should be allowable. Acknowledgment of same is respectfully requested.

***35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections***

Claims 1, 5-11, 13, 18, 22-28, 30, 36-37, 38-41, 46, 48, 49, 57 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Treatch (U.S. 5,697,052) in view of Lusky et al. (U.S. 7,315,573) and in further in view of Leslie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,404,755). . Claims 2 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over

Treatch in view of Lusky and Leslie, and further in view of Sumi (US 4,081,752). Claims 3-4 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Treatch in view of Lusky and Leslie, and further in view of Peterson (US 6,574,198). Claims 35-36 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Treatch in view of Lusky and Leslie, and further in view of Irving et al. (U.S. 6,163,276). Claim 66 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Treatch in view of Lusky and Leslie, , and further in view of Rog et al. (U.S. 6,441,781). Applicants respectfully traverse each of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate features recited in claim 14 and claim 17 has been rewritten in independent form. Applicants submit that claims 1 and 17 are now in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 18, 48 and 57 have also been similarly amended to incorporate subject matter from their respective dependent claims which was indicated as being allowable by the Examiner. Further, claims 34, 53 and 62 have been rewritten in independent form. According, they are now in condition for allowance.

The remaining claims depending from independent claims 1, 18, 48, and 57 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of these claims and indicate all claims as being allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue, or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 29, 2010

By: Linda G. Gunderson

Linda G. Gunderson  
Reg. No. 46,341  
Attorney for Applicant

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
Attn: Patent Department  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-1714  
Telephone: (858) 651-7351  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502